# Proposed Agenda
# WORKING GROUP MEETING
# Thursday, June 3, 1999

## SWANSEA RECREATION CENTER
## 2659 East 49th Avenue
**8:30 AM to 3:00 PM**

Welcome and introductions

Updates
- ✓ Status report from ATSDR
- ✓ Listing status
- ✓ Community involvement update
- ✓ Other updates?

– Risk Assessment status — COC SELECTION; EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT; BIOAVAILABILITY STUDY
- ✓ work needed
- ✓ time frame
- ✓ status of bioavailability studies

CONCEPTUAL MODEL REVISED

– COMMENTS ON RB SAMPLING STUDY WERE DUE ON 4/30/99

WORK PLAN IN JULY
STUDY AUG – OCT

Soil Sampling plan – REVIEW JUNE 21 – 28
FINAL PLAN JULY 1 RESULTS NOV
- ✓ Summary of Technical meeting on statistics (May 19)—conclusions and recommendations for the Working Group
- ✓ Presentation of sampling plan for soil, dust, alleys
- ✓ Relationship between written comments and Work Group discussion
- ✓ Anticipated schedule for field work
- ✓ Feedback from Working Group

**LUNCH BREAK** [We will again bring in lunch—for a small cost to each person.]

Community issues

Comparative Soil Study – COMMENTS DUE JUNE 16
- ✓ Presentation of time frame; discussion of timing concerns
- ✓ Feedback from Working Group

Access plans
- ✓ EPA's plans based on Working Group input
- ✓ Introduction of Marta Valentine, Project Manager for the Sampling plan (contractor)
- ✓ Feedback from Working Group

Meeting evaluation and review of next steps

# Bonnie Lavelle: Next Steps

IN SOW FOR MK ✓

- (CP) Have schools and playgrounds been sampled? (BL) Yes and the data will be checked again to be certain.*

PRESENTED ✓

- (CV) It would be good to see if concentrations are co-located: if the concentration is elevated at depth, is it associated with elevations at the surface?( Bonnie will look at this)*

- (AT) Many post World War II homes were built on landfills. Does the EPA know which were built on landfills and which were not? Homes north of 38th are post-World War II; south of 38th are pre-World War II. Contamination could have been brought in from somewhere else; or it could have been moved around. Where did the dirt come from? EPA should look at where the landfills were and at the age of homes. (CV) The City has a landfill map, but it is very poor. (JT) You could look at topographical maps. (BL) We have a series of aerial photographs that may help in this.*

IN COC SELECTION MEMO & IN SAP FOR PHASE III

- (LG) I do not like to see all the metals lumped together. The failure to test for cadmium and zinc has been a problem; I would like to see future testing for cadmium and zinc. Cadmium moves downward and can contaminate underground water. (CV) When you look at Locations 1 through 5 and 8, they are filthy for arsenic and lead, but cadmium is really low. The risk-based sampling results showed me that the contamination on the really dirty properties is arsenic and lead. (BL) The data that we have: In Phase I and II, we used XRF (X-Ray fluorescence). Perhaps we can look at the two-contaminant mechanisms with GIS and turn off lead and arsenic to check for only cadmium and zinc. Ten percent of all samples were sent to a laboratory, which looked for all metals. In the Physical-Chemical Characteristics study, we took 5% of all samples and looked at cadmium and zinc; these samples spanned all concentration ranges. In the intensive sampling, 100% of the samples were tested for cadmium and zinc. (BL) We will look at all the data and explicitly report our findings related to cadmium and zinc. * (CV) The XRF analysis provides information on all the metals.

- (MelM) Although the chart shows an action level for arsenic and a default level for lead, there is no corresponding level shown for zinc and cadmium. Cadmium has a 2 ppm detection level. Could detection levels be added to this report? (BL) We will flag detection limits in the report.*

- (BobL) The active ingredients in PAX are arsenic trioxide and lead arsenate. (MelM) Has lead arsenate been found in this site? (BL) We need to flag this question. (LG) I would like an opportunity to know how the state is studying arsenic at Globe. (FA) A presentation on this would require a 2-3 hour block. (BL) We can arrange time for this.*

- (JT) When was the house dust sampled (seasons can affect this)? Would people

have had windows and doors open? (BL) Sampling probably occurred in early September.*

- (JT) Eight samples are a poor sample size. This can have it's own set of problems. (BL) We actually took samples form 18 homes but did not have enough mass. (JT) Families are now on alert about dust in their homes. In future sampling, it would be useful to find out people's cleaning schedule and avoid sampling right after they have cleaned. It would be useful to report both loading and concentration from both high and low soil concentration properties. (Bonnie will check to see if this would be useful, and will consult with the risk assessors in order to clarify how the homeowners should be advised as to cleaning).*

- (BL) An ingestion rate assumes a certain percentage of ingestion of dust. Perhaps we can have a session where we can look at the equation to understand better the relationship between dust and soil.* You typically sample a percentage of homes for dust to establish a linear relationship between arsenic in soil and arsenic in dust. Where you have soil concentrations, you can predict for dust. If the dust is not from the soil, the curve will not be linear.

- (MelM) We need to do more sampling of dust in homes. In the earlier sampling, indoor dust in basements was sampled, but not included in the statistical analysis. (Bonnie will find out why it was not included).*

- (JM) How will the information about compositing be considered? Will we get information about alternative plans? (BL) I will go to the contractor with my suggestions and get modifications to the plan.* I will send out a draft of the plan to the Working Group.

- (FH) How comfortable is EPA with the chain of custody of the PAX sample? (BL) We will put this information in the sampling plan.*